

## IN AND FOR NEW CASTLE COUNTY

V.

CA. No.: 09C-02-030 FSS  
E-FILED

**Upon Defendant's Appeal from Commissioner's June 30, 2009  
Scheduling Order – *RECONSIDERATION* – *DENIED***

2. On June 30, 2009 the assigned commissioner entered a scheduling order. The commissioner's assignment is consistent with Superior Court Civil Rule 132 and Superior Court Administrative Directive 2007-5.

3. The record does not show that the commissioner's order is based upon findings of fact that are clearly erroneous, or is contrary to law, or an abuse of discretion. To the contrary, the June 30, 2009 scheduling order is consistent with the court's traditional approach to these matters. Once the final, responsive pleading is

received, the court typically enters a scheduling order.

4. The order at issue, like all scheduling orders, promotes efficient, effective, fair, and prompt administration of justice. A procedural free-for-all is not in anyone's interest. A reasonable scheduling order, like the June 30, 2009 order, is right.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration of the June 30, 2009 scheduling order is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: July 9, 2009

/s/ Fred S. Silverman

Judge

oc: Prothonotary (civil)  
cc: Joeli McCambridge, *pro se* (via US Mail)  
Shirley Bishop, *pro se* (via US Mail)  
Romie Bishop, *pro se* (via US Mail)  
Louis J. Rizzo, Esquire (via Lexis E-file)